

REMARKS

Claims 15-19 and 26-36 are pending.

Claims 15-19, 27-32 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney, U.S. Patent No. 5,917,484 in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Mullaney fails to teach the option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed but asserts that Applicant's specification at pg. 3, lines 5-11, discloses such a feature and that it would have been obvious to include the option in the system of Mullaney because it provides users with an easier way to recognize the language selection option to display the language selection screen by having the option with the same appearance regardless of the display language currently selected.

Applicant previously explained how the prior art discussed in the specification does not actually teach or suggest that the option has the same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed. In response, the Examiner maintains that the this feature is disclosed in applicant's specification at pg. 3, lines 5-11. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized what is actually disclosed by Unexamined Patent Application No. JP-A-6-75732, the information applicant discusses in the passage on page 3 of the specification.

The portion of the specification cited by the Examiner discusses Unexamined Patent Application No. JP-A-6-75732. The specification states that the display allows the user a choice between English and Japanese as the display languages and that the language screen always displays both "English" and "ニホンゴ" (which phonetically corresponds to "NIHONGO," the Japanese word for the "Japanese language," as optional items for selecting English or Japanese respectively regardless of which language is set up. This does not mean that this reference teaches "an option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed," as asserted by the Examiner because they do not look the same.

According to Unexamined Patent Application No. JP-A-6-75732, these two options are alternative options and are not actually displayed on the screen at the same time. Referring to Figs. 4 and 5 of the reference, in level 2 for transition to the selectable language option in level 3, “MESSAGE” is displayed when “English” is selected and “メッセージゲンゴ” (which phonetically corresponds to “message GENGO” and semantically corresponds to “message language”) is displayed when “Japanese” is selected. This is what is meant in the paragraph beginning on line 12 of pg. 3 of applicant’s specification, which states “all items on the screen which *allows the user to set up the language change screen* are displayed in the selected language” (emphasis added). Thus, the option of Unexamined Patent Application No. JP-A-6-75732 which the Examiner corresponds to the claimed option changes appearance depending on the selected language. Further, this option is the only option which could possibly correspond to the claimed option because this option is the only option which, when designated, results in the display of the screen which has a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language. The Examiner can not ignore all of the limitations of the claim which define the term “option” in an attempt to recreate the claimed invention.

Further, although once at the language change screen the option buttons labeled “English and “ニホンゴ” will appear the same no matter what the selected language is, the Examiner cannot assert that either one of these options corresponds to the claimed option because designating these options does not result in the display of the screen which has a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language when designated. The option buttons labeled “English and “ニホンゴ” can only correspond to the claimed “selectable language options for selecting a display language.”

Applicant also submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found no motivation within the prior art to modify Mullaney to incorporate an option which has a same appearance regardless of the language selected.

The buttons labeled “English and “ニホンゴ” in Unexamined Patent Application No. JP-A-6-75732 are the options for actually selecting a language. One of ordinary skill in the art

would not have been motivated to change the “back” button 510 of Mullaney to a language selection option, such as an option labeled “English,” because this would defeat the purpose of going “back” to the language selection screen where the language is to be selected. If you modified Mullaney to include a language selection option on the screen shown in Fig. 5 of Mullaney, instead of the “back” button, there would be no reason to also display the language selection options on the screen shown in Fig. 4 of Mullaney. Thus, even assuming *arguendo* that the option labeled “English” of Unexamined Patent Application No. JP-A-6-75732 corresponds to the claimed option, applicant submits that there would have been no reason to modify Mullaney in the manner necessary to recreate the claimed invention.

Further, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine the references because it would provide users with an easier way to recognize the language selection option to display the language selection screen. However, the “back” button of Mullaney is not a language selection option. Thus, modifying the “back” button of Mullaney would not provide users with an easier way to recognize the language selection option. Thus, the Examiner’s suggested motivation for combining the references is inconsistent with the teachings of Mullaney and is not adequate evidence of a motivation to combine the references to teach the claimed invention.

The Examiner also asserts that one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejection is based on the combination of the references. However, that is not what applicant is doing. Applicant submits that it is proper to show that a reference, even if the reference is being combined with another reference, does not teach what the Examiner asserts. Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that either prior art reference, taken alone or in combination, teaches means for displaying a second screen with an option on the display unit, the option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed, wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated on the second screen. Although the Examiner may be able to find a reference which teaches an option having the same language regardless of the display language currently selected, the remainder of the claim further defines this option (i.e., when the option is selected, the first screen is displayed), and the Examiner has ignored this portion of the claim. The “ENGLISH” option of Applicant’s admitted prior art, when

designated, does not result in the first screen being displayed. Thus, this option cannot possibly correspond to the claimed option.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16-19 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Claims 27 and 30 recite substantially the same feature discussed above in connection with claim 15, and thus are allowable for the same reasons. Claims 28, 29, 31 and 32 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney in view of Kusmierczyk, U.S. Patent No. 5,828,992. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 recites “a dedicated key switch provided outside of the display unit, wherein the display language selection screen is directly displayed on the display unit when the dedicated key switch is operated, the dedicated key switch being used only for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display unit.”

Applicant previously explained that Kusmierczyk does not disclose that the dedicated key switch is used only for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display unit. Kusmierczyk merely uses the F3 key to toggle between two languages, but does not display a language selecting screen. In response, the Examiner again asserts that it is improper to attack the references individually when the rejection is based on a combination of references. However, applicant again submits that the Examiner has ignored a portion of the claim which further defines the limitation he asserts is shown in Kusmierczyk.

Although claim 26 does recite that the dedicated key switch is provided outside of the display unit, the claim also recites that the dedicated key switch is used only for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display unit. The F3 key of Kusmierczyk is not used for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display unit. Thus, the F3 key cannot possibly correspond to the claimed dedicated key switch. The Examiner cannot assert that an

element corresponds to an element of the claim in one respect but not in another. Since the Examiner cannot assert that the F3 key of Kusmierczyk is also used only for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display unit, the Examiner cannot assert that Kusmierczyk teaches the claimed dedicated key switch. Thus, the combination of Mullaney and Kusmierczyk fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 26.

Further, applicant submits that the Examiner's stated motivation for combining these references is flawed. The Examiner is suggesting modifying the "back" button of Mullaney to provide users an easy access to language selection screen by means of utilizing function keys on the keyboard. Applicant fails to see why it is easier to select a function key on a keyboard than to select an option on a display screen. Each step involves pressing just one key/option. Changing the selectable option on the display screen with a key on a keyboard does not make anything easier for the user. Thus, there would have been no reason to modify the Mullaney as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772015100.

Dated: June 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7753